



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## BOOK REVIEWS

---

*Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular.* Grammar, Texts, Glossary. By ALBERT THUMB. Translated from the second improved and enlarged German edition by S. ANGUS. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912.

The well-known excellence of Thumb's *Handbuch der neugriechischen Vulgärsprache* has been enhanced in the second edition of 1910, which is now before us in English dress. The translation is done with skill and thorough comprehension of the subject-matter. I have noted nothing to criticize more important than an initial inconsistency in the rendering of technical terms (on pp. 4, 5, *tönender* appears as "sonant," "sounding," and "voiced," and *tonloser* as "unvoiced" and "voiceless"), or an occasional phrase which has an odd sound in English. A number of misprints and other slight errors or omissions in the German edition, some of which had been pointed out in reviews of the latter, have been corrected. A still uncorrected reference which I have happened on is the first under *νά* in the Glossary: for § 170, correct for the first edition, read § 218.

The fact that the translation is brought out by a publishing firm which handles primarily theological literature is significant of the recognized importance of Modern Greek to the study of New Testament Greek. Some acquaintance with Modern Greek is also essential to the increasing number of our classical students who are able to enjoy a visit of some length in Greece, and is unquestionably of the greatest value and interest to all students of ancient Greek, and to all interested in general linguistic development. For there is no other language the known history of which covers so long a period as Greek, and none which furnishes more interesting illustrations of various phases of linguistic development than modern, in its relation to ancient Greek. It is the especial merit and distinction of Thumb's book that it furnishes a practical and at the same time scientific account of the vernacular, including local variations which are given with considerable fulness. It deals exclusively with the spoken language and does not confuse the picture by introducing features of the *καθαρεύουσα* or "purified" written language, which has formed the basis of the majority of manuals of Modern Greek. The inflectional types are not forced into the ancient molds, but are given a classification which seems best adapted to represent the present situation. At the same time the historical development is often hinted at in brief notes.

But if we were to offer any suggestion for a third edition, it would be

that, in deference to the main interest of the majority of those who will use the book,<sup>1</sup> the historical comments be introduced more freely, even at the expense of excising some of the information on the peculiarities of the remoter dialects. For, in spite of the fact that investigators in this field are none too numerous and that the articles of the most productive of these, Hatzidakis, are now mostly incorporated in either his *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik* or his *Μεσαιωνικά καὶ νέα Ἑλληνικά*, it is still no light task to run down the discussion of a given phenomenon. Thumb would render a service which would be appreciated by all, if, in connection with each inflectional type described, he should add a reference to the best discussion of its development or give the gist of the explanation. This last he has often done, as already remarked. But again, many an explanation which is simple enough, but not so obvious to the student as to be taken for granted, is lacking (e.g., of the third plural present active ending in *γράφουν* = *γράφουσι*), or a comment is so condensed that the student who does not know the fuller discussion upon which it is based will make nothing out of it (e.g., § 220.2, on the endings of the imperfect passive, or § 227.2, on the development of the perfect type *ἔχω δέσει*). Furthermore, the total lack of etymological notes in the Glossary, though the author has doubtless considered the question and decided adversely, is to my mind unfortunate. It is true that the source of a large percentage of the words is obvious, even where the meaning has greatly changed. It is unnecessary to state the source of *κά(μ)νω* "do, make," *τρώγω* "eat," *μιλῶ* (*ὁμιλῶ*) "speak," *σκοτώνω* "kill," and the like. It is less obvious that, for example, *παίρνω* "take, get" (e.g., in aorist, *πάρε τό* "take it," *ποῦ τὸ πήρε* "where did he get it?") comes from *ἐπαίρω* "raise up, lift," which appears in early church writings as the equivalent of *λαμβάνω*, or that *γλυτώνω* "rescue, escape, disappear" is connected with *ἐκλύω* "release." And who will suspect, without some hint, that *μαλώνω* "quarrel, scold" is connected with *ὁμαλός* "even, level" (whence the verb "make even, level, correct, scold"; cf. our euphemistic use of "correct")?

It may not be unwelcome to readers of *Classical Philology* if I make this brief notice of Thumb's book the occasion to summarize the most significant characteristics of the modern inflectional system in its relation to that of the ancient language.<sup>2</sup> The changes in pronunciation are more familiar and

<sup>1</sup> I mean that of those who look for something more than a brief practical account of the common vernacular, such as is furnished by Wied's little book translated by Mrs. Gardner, more are interested in the historical explanation of the usual vernacular forms in their relation to ancient Greek than in the dialectic variations. This is by no means to underrate the importance of these latter to the specialist or to fail to appreciate the convenience to him of having these brought together in systematic form. And some of them of course help to shed light on the history of the common forms.

<sup>2</sup> The most concise statement of the facts, all comments on the historical development being omitted, is given by Hatzidakis, *Περὶ τῆς χρήσεως τῶν γραμματικῶν τύπων*

need not be reviewed here, but must be borne in mind as an essential factor in much, though not all, of the widespread analogical leveling which has taken place. Most important is the identity in sound of  $\iota$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\omicron$ , and  $\upsilon$ , of  $\alpha\iota$  and  $\epsilon$ , of  $\alpha\upsilon$ ,  $\epsilon\upsilon$  with  $\alpha\phi$ ,  $\epsilon\phi$ , or  $\alpha\beta$ ,  $\epsilon\beta$ , etc., though the resulting leveling is often disguised by the customary retention of the etymological spelling, or, in some cases, what is falsely believed to be the etymological spelling.

## NOUNS

*Number.*—There is no dual. This has been obsolete in the spoken language for over two thousand years.

*Cases.*—The dative case has gone out of use. The indirect object, in the widest sense, is expressed by the genitive (or accusative; see below) or by the prepositional phrase  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  ('s,  $\sigma\epsilon$ ) with the accusative. Thus  $\tau\omicron\upsilon \xi\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon \tau\omicron \beta\epsilon\beta\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron$  "gave him the book" (so regularly with pronouns, unless emphatic as  $\xi\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon \tau\omicron \beta\epsilon\beta\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron$  's  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$  "gave the book to him"),  $\xi\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon \tau\omicron\upsilon \pi\alpha\iota\delta\iota\omicron\upsilon \tau\omicron \beta\epsilon\beta\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron$  "gave the boy the book" or  $\xi\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon \tau\omicron \beta\epsilon\beta\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron$  's  $\tau\omicron \pi\alpha\iota\delta\acute{\iota}$ . This use of the genitive developed out of the possessive genitive, like the corresponding substitution in Old Persian and elsewhere, for which cf. Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax*, I, 192 ff. Where the accusative<sup>1</sup> is used (e.g.,  $\tau\omicron\nu \xi\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon \tau\omicron \beta\epsilon\beta\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron$ ), this is simply an extension of its use as the direct object, the difference between direct and indirect object being shown only by the word-order, just as in present English, except where a prepositional clause is employed.

Other uses of the dative and many of the old uses of the genitive are replaced by prepositional phrases, all prepositions being followed by the accusative, e.g.,  $\sigma\kappa\omicron\tau\acute{\omega}\theta\eta\kappa\epsilon \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron \tau\omicron\nu \acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\rho\phi\acute{\omicron}\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon$  "he was killed by his brother,"  $\xi\phi\upsilon\gamma\epsilon \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron \tau\omicron \sigma\pi\acute{\iota}\tau\iota$  "he fled from the house." Since there is a distinct vocative form only for  $\omicron$ -stems, we have generally, much as in English, a three-case system which is often further reduced to two by the frequent identity of the nominative and accusative forms.

$\acute{\epsilon}\nu \tau\eta \gamma\rho\alpha\phi\iota\kappa\eta \eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu \gamma\lambda\acute{\omega}\sigma\sigma\eta$ . For each inflectional class are distinguished: (1) ancient forms which are wholly obsolete; (2) ancient forms which are still used in the written language; (3) ancient forms which survive in the spoken language; (4) new forms in the spoken language. We are concerned here only with the last two categories.

<sup>1</sup> In the singular the use of the accusative is northern, that of the genitive southern, but the latter construction tends to become the standard. In the plural, however, the accusative forms are practically universal, just as they are also used in real genitive constructions. The normal is, then,  $\tau\omicron\upsilon \xi\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon$  but  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \xi\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon$ , as also  $\tau\omicron \delta\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron} \tau\omicron\upsilon$  "his" but  $\tau\omicron \delta\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron} \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  "their." Some of the statements of Thumb, § 54(b), are misleading. He says that "the Epirote *Zalakwstas*—in contrast to the Epirotes *Bhlapās* and *Balawritēs*—uses the accusative in his tales from Epirus (*Texts*, I. d. 1, 2, 3)." But these tales show the accusative in the plural, but the genitive in the singular, exactly as do the writings of Πάλλης and others whom Thumb cites as using the genitive. Thus, in the second tale,  $\sigma\omicron\upsilon \delta\acute{\omega}\kappa\omega$ ,  $\tau\omicron\upsilon \epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon$ ,  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon \tau\eta\varsigma \mu\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\alpha\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon$ , but  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \xi\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon$ ,  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon$  (just as in the possessive construction, in the last line,  $\tau\eta \gamma\upsilon\upsilon\alpha\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha \tau\omicron\upsilon$ , but  $\tau\eta \zeta\omega\acute{\eta} \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ ). The practice of Ψυχάρης, whom Thumb also cites among those using the accusative, is precisely the same (genitive singular, accusative plural), wherever I have consulted his writings.

*First declension.*—The nominative and accusative plural end in *-es*, e.g., *τρῆς (ῆ)μέρες*. Although frequently written *-ais*, owing to a false notion of its origin, the ending is *-es*, taken over from the third declension,<sup>1</sup> where the nominative plural form had come to be used for the accusative in Hellenistic times (in some dialects much earlier; cf. my *Greek Dialects*, § 107.4). The earliest examples of transfer to the first declension are *ἐχούσες = ἐχούσας* in an Epidaurian inscription of the first century A.D. (*IG*, IV, 940), and *ἄλλες, ταῦτες = ἄλλας, ταύτας* in a Rhodian inscription of a not much later date (*IG*, XII, i, 937). Another plural formation, and one of growing popularity, is that in *-δες*, after the analogy of dental stems, e.g., *παπᾶς*, pl. *παπάδες, μαθητής*, pl. *μαθητάδες* beside *μαθητές* (Thumb, §§ 70–79, 88–90).

In the singular, extensive leveling, beginning in Hellenistic times, has removed all vowel variation. Thus *γλώσσα*, gen. *γλώσσας*, not *γλώσσης*, *θάλασσα*, gen. *θάλασσας* (note the leveling in accent also); similarly the masculines *παπᾶς*, gen. *παπᾶ* (as even in Attic for words in *-ās*), *κλέφτης*, gen. *κλέφτη*, not *κλέφτου*, and so in loan-words like *καφές*, gen. *καφέ*.

*The second declension.*—This is the one least changed. But the old feminines have changed either their gender or declension or been replaced by other words (Thumb, § 63.2). Diminutives in *-ί* from *-ίον*, as *παιδί*, gen. *παιδιοῦ*, pl. *παιδιά*, form an important class.

*The third declension.*—This has been in large measure merged with the first. The starting-point was the accusative singular. From consonant stems, forms in *-αν*, with *ν* added after the analogy of vowel stems, occasionally appear in the ancient dialects (cf. my *Greek Dialects*, § 107.1) and are very common in the *κοινή*, e.g., *ἄνδραν, παῖδαν, γυναικᾶν, μητέραν* (cf. especially Dieterich, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griech. Sprache*, pp. 159 ff.). The identity with the accusative of the first declension led to new nominatives in *-ας* or *-α* according to the gender, as *πατέρας* from *πατέραν* or *μητέρα* from *μητέραν*; and the genitive singular followed suit, hence *πατέρα, μητέρας*. But some masculines show *ο*-stem forms in the genitive singular and in the plural. Thus *κόρακας*, gen. sing. *κόρακον*, acc. sing. *κόρακα*, nom. pl. *κόρακοι*, acc. pl. *κόρακους*. A genitive in *-ους* also occurs, as *ἄνδρους* to nom. *ἄνδρας*, this being a blend of *-ου* and the old

<sup>1</sup> So first G. Meyer, *Bezz. Beitr.*, I, 230 (cf. also XIX, 157), who thought the transfer was specifically induced by the large number of consonant stems which came to follow the first declension in the singular (see below). While it is not necessary to assume this as a factor, the possibility is not so definitely excluded on chronological grounds as is stated by Hatzidakis, *Μεσαιωνικά*, I, 12. For the earliest sporadic occurrences of nominative singular *-ας* or *-α* in consonant stems (not to mention the earlier accusatives in *-αν*) are nearly enough contemporaneous with those of *-ες* in vowel stems to render any decision as to their priority unsafe. Another question is whether, as Dieterich, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*, pp. 156 ff., states, the *-ες* came into the nominative plural of the first declension some centuries later than into the accusative, or if, as seems to me more probable, it is only accidental that the earliest occurrences are accusatives.

-ος which is occasionally preserved. Neuters like *ὄνομα* regularly have gen. sing. *ὀνομάτων*, etc.

In *ι*-stems the identity of the accusative singular with that of first declension feminines in *-η*, e.g., *πράξι(ν)* in pronunciation precisely like *κόρη(ν)*, led to a complete transfer to the latter type. Hence nom. *πράξη*, gen. *πράξης*, though the customary spelling is *πράξι*, gen. *πράξις*.

In the article the nom. pl. *οἱ* is also used for the feminine, e.g., *οἱ γλῶσσες*. Some few examples occur in papyri, as *οἱ ἄνδρες καὶ οἱ γυναῖκες*. But, owing to a modern misunderstanding of its origin, the feminine form is commonly written *ἡ*. Cf. especially Psichari, *Essais de grammaire historique néo-grecque*, pp. 34 ff. In the accusative plural feminine, *τές* (*ταῖς*) is now less common than *τίς* (*τής*), with vowel assimilated to that of the nominative.

#### ADJECTIVES

Besides those of the first and second declension, which are by far the most common, several *ν*-stem adjectives have survived, though with encroachment of *ο*-stem forms in many of the cases, and have even drawn some original *ο*-stems into this type. Thus not only *γλυκός*, *βαθύς*, *βαρύνς*, etc., but also *μακρύνς*, *πικρύνς*, *ἐλαφρύνς*. An especially interesting analogical extension is that of *-υτερος* from *γλυκύτερος*, etc., to *καλύτερος*, *μεγαλύτερος*, *πρωτύτερος*, etc. (commonly spelled *-ητερος*, *-ειτερος*, or *-ιτερος*). There is also a periphrastic comparative formed by prefixing *πῶ* "more" (from *πλέον*<sup>1</sup>) to the positive, e.g., *πῶ ὁμορφος* "more beautiful." As in English, the periphrastic form is preferred when the adjective is polysyllabic or of participial origin. The superlative is formed by prefixing the article to the comparative, as *ὁ καλύτερος* "the best."

#### PRONOUNS

*Personal pronouns*.—First person *ἐγώ*, gen. and acc. sing. *ἐμένα* (conjunctive *μοῦ*, *με*), based upon the old acc. *ἐμέ* which under the influence of other accusatives was extended first to *ἐμέν*, then to *ἐμέναν*<sup>2</sup>; plural

<sup>1</sup> *πλέον* gives regularly *πῶ* whence, with loss of *λ*, *πῶ*. So Thumb, §§ 32, 119, who makes no reference to the criticism of Kretschmer, *Der heutige lesbische Dialekt*, pp. 161 ff., 251 ff. Kretschmer believes that *πῶ* cannot come from *πῶ*, since *λ* regularly remains as palatalized *l*, but is borrowed from Italian *più* with *o* taken from *πῶ*; and he finds support for this in the fact that the periphrastic type is especially common in the islands which have been most subject to Venetian and Genoese influence, while it is lacking in Epirus. But *πῶ* is certainly the form used throughout almost the whole of the Greek mainland, and the assumption that it is from the Italian is far more daring than that of a phonetic loss of *λ*. For, though in most positions a change of *λ* to *ζ* is limited to a few dialects (e.g., *πουνά* = *πουνιζά*, Siphnos), there is nothing to disprove that it was more general in the particular combination involved here.

<sup>2</sup> The first step, leading to *ἐμέν* (likewise *ἐσέν*), which occurs as early as the third century A.D. and is still in use in some dialects, is parallel to the extension of the accusative ending seen in *μητέρα*, etc., and was inevitable. But the precise source

ἐμεῖς, ἐμᾶς (conjunctive μᾶς) with ε instead of η after the analogy of the singular ἐγώ, ἐμένα. Second person ἐσύ beside σύ, gen. and acc. sing. ἐσένα (conjunctive σοῦ, σε), with ε after the analogy of ἐγώ, ἐμένα; plural ἐσεῖς, ἐσᾶς (conjunctive σεῖς, σᾶς) formed from the singular ἐσύ, etc., in place of the old ὑμεῖς which became identical in sound with ἡμεῖς.<sup>1</sup> For the third person αὐτός is used, or, when unemphatic, forms of the article. The old possessive pronouns are obsolete, their place being taken by the genitive of the pronoun, or, when emphatic or predicate, by δικός (from εἰδικός "special") and the genitive, e.g., εἶναι τὸ δικό μου "it is mine." The demonstratives are: αὐτός; τοῦτος from οὗτος, with generalization of τουτ- which is seen in some of the ancient dialects, also ἐτοῦτος with ἐ from ἐκεῖνος; and ἐκεῖνος.

The old τόσος, which in Attic prose is displaced by τοσοῦτος except in certain adverbial phrases, has again in turn driven out the latter.<sup>2</sup> Likewise τοῖος, for which Attic usually has τοιοῦτος, is preserved in τέτοιος "such a," which is a blend of τί and ἐτοῖος (cf. ἐτοῦτος above).<sup>3</sup>

The interrogative τίς is almost obsolete except in the form τί, which may be used with a noun of any gender, e.g., τί ὥρα εἶναι "what time is it?" The regular interrogative with full declension is now ποῖός (ποῖος).

The indefinite τίς survives only in certain combinations, as τί-ποτε "anything, nothing," κάτι "some," etc. Its place is taken by κανείς (or κανένας), fem. καμμία, which is formed by prefixing κᾶν (= καὶ ἄν) to "one."

of the second extension, leading to ἐμέναν (ἐσέναν), which is attested from the twelfth century, is not wholly clear, in spite of what is suggested by W. Meyer, *Commentaire Simon Portius*, p. 164, and by Hatzidakis, *Μεσαιωνικά*, I, 56. According to the former, ἐμένα(ν) was formed after πατέρα(ν), etc.; while the latter thinks it was formed in part after other accusatives like τίνα(ν), δεῖνα(ν), ἄνδρα(ν), γυναῖκα(ν), and in part often the analogy of certain increments common in pronouns, as in ἐκείνοῦ, ἐκείνοῦδᾶ, αὐτοῦ, etc., ἐκείνοῦ, τουτοῦ, etc. But these forms in -a are themselves in need of explanation (those in -ε are explained as having ε detached from a following word, especially augmented verb-forms, e.g., τὸν ἐγνώρισα). Or does H. mean to suggest by his collocation of ἐκείνοῦδᾶ (= ἐκεῖνο δᾶ) with ἐκείνοῦ, etc., that the latter may contain νά "there"?

<sup>1</sup> The view that the loss of ὑμεῖς was due to its identity in sound with ἡμεῖς is criticized by Hatzidakis in his review of W. Meyer, *Simon Portius* (cf. *Μεσαιωνικά*, II, 467) on the ground that the new formation ἐσεῖς is earlier than the identity of η and υ. But though σεῖς, which W. Meyer thought not earlier than the twelfth century, is now attested in a papyrus of the sixth (Dieterich, *Untersuchungen*, p. 191), it is also true that confusion between υ and ι or η is frequent in papyri of the second and third centuries (Dieterich, p. 24). Whatever the date of the complete identity of υ and η (ι), it is evident that the resemblance was close enough at an early date to be a factor in the preference for the analogical σεῖς.

<sup>2</sup> Hence the occasional appearance of τόσος in papyri, noted by Mayser, *Grammatik der griech. Papyri*, p. 309, should occasion no surprise. The restoration of τόσος to general use was assisted by the correlatives πῶσος and ὅσος, which have held their place at all times.

<sup>3</sup> But see now Hatzidakis, *Idg. Forsch.*, XXXIII, 352 ff.

This gave rise to a feeling for an indefinite prefix *καν-* or *κα-* (note that the feminine is in pronunciation *κα-μία*), whence were formed *κάμπος* "some-what large, rather large," *κάποιος* "somebody, some," *κάτι* "some" (used as an indeclinable adjective), and *κάτιτι* "something." The last-named forms are used positively, while *κανένας* and *τίποτε* are regularly employed with negatives, and, like French *pas*, *point*, etc., have absorbed the force of the accompanying negative, so that when used alone, as in answer to a question, they are themselves negative. Thus *κανένας* "nobody," *τίποτε* "nothing," and likewise *ποτέ* "never," *πουθενά* "nowhere."

*καθεὶς* (or *καθένας*) "each one, every one," fem. *καθεμία*, also indeclinable adjective *κάθε* (e.g., *κάθε βράδυ* "every evening"), is built up from the distributive phrase *καθ' ἓνα*.

The relative pronoun is now the indeclinable *ποῦ*, from an earlier *ὅπου* "where." For oblique cases the proper form of the conjunctive pronoun is generally added. Thus *τὸ παιδί ποῦ ἦρθε* "the boy who came," but *τὸ παιδί ποῦ τὸν ἔστειλα* "the boy whom I sent." *ὅποιος*, *ὅσος* and *ὅτι* are usual as indefinite relatives, e.g., *ὅποιος εἶναι* "whoever it is," *ὅσα θέλεις* "as much as you wish," *ὅτι ὥρα θέλεις* "whenever you wish."

#### VERBS

*Voices*.—Instead of three voices there are now only two. The old middle and passive are merged in one, which is in form derived from the old passive. That is, where the two voices were differentiated in form, as in the aorist, it is the passive form which has survived, e.g., *γράφομαι*, aorist not *ἐγραψάμην*, but *ἐγράφηκα* or *ἐγράφτηκα* (*φτ* from *φθ*), formed by adding *κα* (which spread from active aorists like *ἔδωκα*) to the stems of *ἐγράφην* or *ἐγράφηην*. But the meaning is by no means exclusively passive, many of the uses of the old middle being retained. Deponents like *φοβοῦμαι*, *ἐφοβήθηκα* "am afraid, was afraid" are very numerous, likewise those which denote reflexive or reciprocal action, as *πλένομαι* "wash myself," *γνωρίζονται* "they recognize one another." The causative use (*ἐδίδαξάμην σε* "I had you taught" Ar.) gives rise to a peculiar idiom, especially common with negatives, as *πιάνεται* "lets himself be caught," *δέν πιάνεται* "is not to be caught," *τὸ κρασί δέν πίνεται* "the wine is not to be drunk, is not drinkable," *δέν τρώγεται* "is not eatable," etc. But the ancient use of the middle to denote action in one's own interest, etc., involved such a delicate and often vague distinction from the active that it is now almost wholly obsolete.<sup>1</sup>

*Moods*.—The old optative, which in the New Testament was already restricted to very narrow limits, has entirely disappeared. The subjunctive is used only with conjunctions, especially *νά* (from *ἵνα*), with which it has

<sup>1</sup> For the use of the voices cf. Thumb, §§ 175–177, and especially Hatzidakis, *IF*, XXV, 357 ff., and *περὶ τῆς χρήσεως τῶν μέσων, τῶν μεταβατικῶν καὶ ἀμεταβάτων ῥημάτων ἐν τῇ νέᾳ Ἑλληνικῇ* (Athens, 1911).



taken the place of the old infinitive and also developed some independent uses, as deliberative  $\tau\acute{\iota}$   $\nu\acute{\alpha}$   $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$  "what shall I do?" or volitive as  $\nu\acute{\alpha}$   $\iota\delta\omega$  "let me see." Of the old imperative, the forms of the second person are still in use, while the third person is expressed by  $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  (from  $\acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\varsigma$  "leave"<sup>1</sup>) with the subjunctive, e.g.,  $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$   $\iota\delta\eta$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$   $\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon\nu$  "let him (them) see" (similarly  $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$   $\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon$  "let us see").

The "conditional," used in the conclusion of unreal conditions, is in form a past future, e.g.,  $\theta\acute{\alpha}$   $\xi\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\epsilon$  (or  $\eta\theta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$   $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\epsilon\iota$ ) "he would write,"  $\theta\acute{\alpha}$   $\epsilon\iota\chi\epsilon$   $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\epsilon\iota$  "he would have written."

There are two participles, a present active, which is indeclinable, as  $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$ , and a perfect passive, with loss of the old reduplication, as  $\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ . There are no infinitives.

*Tenses.*—Of the old tenses the present, imperfect, and aorist are preserved, while the future, perfect, and pluperfect are lost. But there are five periphrastic tenses, as follows:

Future (durative, etc.),  $\theta\acute{\alpha}$   $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\omega$  "I shall be writing (all day)" or "I shall write (regularly)."

Future (aoristic),  $\theta\acute{\alpha}$   $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\omega$  "I shall write (you a letter)."

The difference between the two futures is one of "aspect" or kind of action. That is, the distinction, which for past time is indicated by the use of the imperfect or aorist, is in the modern language extended to future time. In form these futures are abbreviated from the phrases  $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$   $\nu\acute{\alpha}$   $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\omega$ ,  $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma$   $\nu\acute{\alpha}$   $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\eta\varsigma$ , etc., and  $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$   $\nu\acute{\alpha}$   $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\omega$ , etc., and so resemble in origin our English "will," future. The  $\theta\acute{\alpha}$  arose first in the third singular, where it stands for an earlier  $\theta\epsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}$  containing  $\theta\acute{\epsilon}$ = $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota$ . Another type of future, once in very common use, is  $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$   $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\iota$  (or  $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\epsilon\iota$ ), in which  $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\iota$  and  $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\epsilon\iota$  are from the infinitives  $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\iota\nu$  and  $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\epsilon\iota\nu$ , the latter a very early remodelling of  $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\alpha\iota$  after the analogy of the present infinitive.

Perfect  $\xi\chi\omega$   $\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron$  or  $\xi\chi\omega$   $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\epsilon\iota$ .

Pluperfect  $\epsilon\iota\chi\alpha$   $\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron$  or  $\epsilon\iota\chi\alpha$   $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\epsilon\iota$ .

Future Perfect  $\theta\acute{\alpha}$   $\xi\chi\omega$   $\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron$  or  $\theta\acute{\alpha}$   $\xi\chi\omega$   $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\epsilon\iota$ .

The first method of formation is of transparent origin, being parallel to that seen in the corresponding compound tenses of English and many other modern languages, and has its beginnings in ancient times. But the second method,  $\xi\chi\omega$   $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\epsilon\iota$ , etc., in which  $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\epsilon\iota$  represents the old aorist infinitive just as in the future  $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$   $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\epsilon\iota$  (see above), is of comparatively recent date and the result of a complicated development. In the Middle Ages phrases like  $\xi\chi\omega$   $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\epsilon\iota$  were frequently employed with future force. This development of meaning is readily understood and is parallel to that of the

<sup>1</sup> Cf.  $\acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\varsigma$   $\iota\delta\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$ , Math. 27:49, etc., and see Moulton, *Grammar of the New Testament*, I, 175. This origin of  $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ , first noted by Koraes, is too evident to be discarded in favor of derivation from  $\xi\alpha\sigma\epsilon$ , which has been urged by Jannaris, *Historical Greek Grammar*, § 1916, and is given as an alternative by Thumb, § 194.2. Cf. Hatzidakis, *Μεσαιωνικά*, I, 197, 210; Psaltes, *Glotta*, III, 87; and Schwyzler, *Idg. Anz.*, XXVIII, 57.

Romance future from *scribere habeo*, etc. But from "shall write" to "have written" there could be no direct transition. The explanation is found in the phrase *εἶχα γράψαι*. As *ἔχω γράψαι* was used like *θέλω γράψαι*, so *εἶχα γράψαι* like *ἤθελα γράψαι*. That is, it had modal force, and may be compared to the Romance conditional from *scribere habebam*. Thus *γράφειν εἶχα καὶ πλείότερον*, literally "I had more to write" but meaning simply "I might write more," *νὰ μὴ εἶχα σε γνωρίσει* "would that I did not know you" or also "would that I had not known you." From its use as a past modal the phrase came in time to be employed where there was no modal force, simply as a tense of past time, either perfect or pluperfect. The last step was that, owing to the parallelism with *εἶχα γραμμένο*, *εἶχα γράψαι* became restricted to the pluperfect use, and a new perfect, *ἔχω γράψαι* parallel to *ἔχω γραμμένο*, was formed to it.<sup>1</sup>

*Inflection of the present indicative active.*—*γράφω, γράφεις, γράφει, γράφομε* (or *-οιμε*), *γράφετε, γράφουν* or *γράφουνε*. The third plural owes its form to the interchange of the primary and secondary endings, which begins in early times. As *-αν* beside *-ασι* in the perfect in the last centuries B.C. (*ἀπέσταλκάν*, etc.), and conversely, some centuries later, *-ασι* beside *-αν* in the aorist (*εἵπασι*, etc.), so are found forms like *γράφουν* beside *γράφουσι*, and these ultimately prevailed, except in a few dialects which still preserve the old forms in *-ουσι*. In *γράφουνε* the *ε* is due to the analogy of the endings of the first and second plural.

The imperfect and the aorist active now have uniform inflection, a blend of the two original types. Thus imperfect *ἔγραφα, ἔγραφες, ἔγραφε, ἐγράφαμε,*<sup>2</sup> *ἐγράφετε* or *ἐγράφατε, ἔγραφαν* or *ἐγράφανε*; and aorist *ἔγραψα, ἔγραψες*, etc., in precisely the same way.

*Present indicative passive.*—*γράφομαι* (or *-οιμαι*), *γράφῃσαι, γράφεται, γράφομαστε* (or *-ούμαστε*), *γράφεσθε, γράφονται*. Forms like *γράφῃσαι*, with *-σαι* after the analogy of *τίθῃσαι*, etc., are already current in Hellenistic times. For the ending *-μαστε* and the *ου* in *γράφονται*, etc., see below under the imperfect.

*Imperfect passive.*—*ἐγράφονμουν, ἐγράφουσουν, ἐγράφονταν, ἐγραφοῦμαστε, ἐγραφοῦσαστε, ἐγράφονταν*.<sup>2</sup> These forms, of which there are numerous variants, bear no apparent resemblance to the original, and it is safe to say that no other inflectional type has undergone such a wholesale transformation. While it is clear in general that this has taken place "through the mutual action of the different persons on one another and by the action of the active upon the passive" (Thumb, § 220. 2), the question of the precise steps in this development offers several unsettled problems.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The chronological development, with numerous citations, is given by Hatzidakis, *Sitzungsber. Berl. Akad.* (1900), pp. 1088 ff., and *Μεσαιωνικά*, I, 598 ff.

<sup>2</sup> The *augment* is commonly omitted when unaccented.

<sup>3</sup> The most easily explained form is the third plural, in which the old *-οντο* blended with the active *-αν* into *-ονταν*. Forms like *ἐρχονταν* and also *ἐρχόντησαν* are those

*Contract verbs.*—Most of the old verbs in -άω and -έω are now inflected according to a uniform type, which shows a fusion of forms belonging to each of the two classes. Thus the present of ῥωτῶ “ask” (ἐρωτάω) : ῥωτῶ, ῥωτᾶς or ῥωτάεις, ῥωτᾶ or ῥωτάει, ῥωτοῦμε, ῥωτᾶτε, ῥωτοῦν(ε); of φοβοῦμαι “fear” (deponent) : φοβοῦμαι, φοβᾶσαι, φοβᾶται, φοβοῦμαστε, φοβᾶστε, φοβοῦνται. The forms ῥωτάεις and ῥωτάει are not, of course, relics of uncontracted inflection, but are new formations of ῥωτᾶς and ῥωτᾶ with endings after the analogy of γράφεις, γράφει. The imperfect active is ἐρωτοῦσα, ἐρωτοῦσες, etc. This is built up from such Hellenistic third plurals as παρεκάλουνσαν, etc., with -σαν from the σ- aorist.

*The verb “To be.”*—Present εἶμαι, εἶσαι, εἶναι, εἶμαστε, εἴστε, εἶναι. Imperfect ἤμουν(α), ἤσουν(α), ἤταν(ε) or ἤτον(ε), ἤμαστε, ἤσαστε, ἤταν(ε) or ἤτονε. Middle forms begin to appear in Hellenistic Greek, as ἤμην, ἤμεθα in the New Testament, etc. (cf. also pres. subj. ἦται in a Delphian, ἦνται in a Messenian, inscription). The present indicative took on middle endings later, and after εἰ of εἰμί had been extended to other forms as εἰμέν for earlier ἐσμέν. εἶναι comes from ἐνι (=ἐνεστι), which was used, like French *il y a*, in the sense of “there is,” “there are,” and later as a simple copula. The change in the vowels is due to the analogy of εἶμαι, εἶσαι.

regularly employed, for example, in the Chronicle of Morea. The *ou* which now prevails before all the endings in the imperfect and also in the present γράφονται (and sometimes γράφουμαι, γραφούμαστε) is ascribed to the influence of the active γράφουν. But a contributory factor certainly, at least in the spread of *ou* from the third plural, was the influence of the contract verbs. Among forms with middle endings the strongest contingent of those in most common use is furnished by the contract deponents like φοβοῦμαι, κοιμοῦμαι, λιποῦμαι, θυμοῦμαι, etc.; and they have *ou* in the imperfect throughout, and in the present in the same three persons which may have *ou* in γράφομαι, e.g., φοβοῦμαι but φοβᾶσαι (cf. Thumb, § 241).

In the third singular ἐγράφετο became ἐγράφετον with *ν* added after the analogy of the active εἶπεν, ἔλεγε, etc. Such forms begin to appear in late inscriptions (Hatzidakis, *Einleitung*, p. 111), are regular in mediaeval writings (e.g., ἐγένετον, ἔρχετον, εὐρίσκετον, etc., Chronicle of Morea), and Simon Portius in the seventeenth century still gives ἐγράφετον beside ἐγράφουντο. How this came to be replaced by the third plural form has not been satisfactorily explained (cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Simon Portius*, p. 198). I believe the substitution to be subsequent to, and consequent upon, the merging of third singular and third plural in the imperfect of the verb “to be,” for which see below.

For the first and second singular one starts from ἐγραφόμην and ἐγράφεσο (cf. γράφεσαι above). Whence the endings -μουν and -σουν? The *ν* is an extension from the first and third to the second person. The prevailing opinion seems to be that the *ou* also originated in the first person by phonetic change of the unaccented vowel after *μ*, and was extended to the second person. So Meyer-Lübke, *Simon Portius*, p. 198, Hatzidakis, *Einleitung*, p. 61. But such a phonetic change is otherwise comparatively rare and locally restricted, and Hatzidakis, *Μεσαιωνικά*, II, 293, remarks that the ending -μουν is the only case in which it is at all general. This leads one to consider the possibility that *ou* arose first in the second singular -σο and was extended to the first. *ou* from *o* (Hatzidakis, *Μεσαιωνικά*, II, 282 ff.) is more widespread than *ou* from *η* (*i*, *υ*), and one might further think of influence from the side of the pronoun

The forms of the third singular and third plural imperfect go back to a third singular *ἦτο*, which became *ἦτον* (cf. *IG*, XIV, 1890) with *ν* added after the analogy of active forms, just as in *ἐλέγετον*, etc. (above, p. 94). In mediaeval writings *ἦτον* is singular only, the plural being *ἦσαν* or *ἦσασιν*, e.g., in the Chronicle of Morea regularly, though *ἦταν* appears occasionally in the later MS P. This *ἦταν* was formed to the singular *ἦτον* after the other plurals in *-αν*. In the seventeenth century the singular and plural were still differentiated. Simon Portius gives sing. *ἦτον*, pl. *ἦταν* or *ἦσαν*, and Romanos gives sing. *ἦτον*, pl. *ἦταν*. But the fact that the two forms differed now only in the unstressed vowel, coupled with the identity of third singular and third plural in the present *εἶναι*, led to the promiscuous use of both forms as singular or plural. Finally this reacted on the inflection of the regular verbs (above, p. 94).

*Formation of the present stem.*—Of the numerous shifts and extensions the following may be noted here. All the old *μν*-verbs, except the verb

*ἔσθ* which in several dialects is *ἔσού*. Neither point of view, it is true, furnishes an adequate explanation, since the ending *-σουν* is not dialectic, but the one in common use everywhere. But admitting that there is a phonetic difficulty with the *ου*, whether one starts from the first or second person, there is ground for believing, in contrast to previous discussions, that the second person is the proper point of attack, as the one in which *ου* has the priority. The form *ἦσου* of 403 A.D. (Migne, LXXIX, 544 B, quoted by Dieterich, *Untersuchungen*, p. 224) is far earlier than any example of *-μουν*. In the vulgar Greek poems of Prodomos we read: *ἐγὼ ἤμην ὑποληπτική καὶ σὺ ἦσουν ματζουμάτος* (Legrand, *Bibliothèque grecque vulgaire*, I, 40, l. 68), and constantly first person in *-μην* in the texts, pp. 38–103. Only the text, pp. 102–24, from a MS which is full of later forms (cf. Psichari, *Essais* I, 121 ff.), substitutes *ἤμουν* or *ἤμουνε* for *ἤμην* of the corresponding text from a better MS, pp. 101–6. Another poem believed to be of twelfth century redaction (Lambros, *Collection de romans grecs*, 289 ff.) has *ἤμην*, l. 637 (and constantly), but *ἤσουν*, l. 639. In the dialect of Carpathus the old ending *-μην* is still preserved, but the second person ends in *-σουν*. Thus, from Manolaki *Καρπαθιακά*, *ἤμην* frequently (e.g., pp. 221, 228, 230, 242, 249, 253 [bis]; once, however, *ἤμουν*, p. 258, doubtless an encroachment of the common type), *ῥοιμούμη(ν)*, *ῥανδρενύμη(ν)*, etc., but *ἤσουν*, pp. 250, 252, 256.

In the first plural *-μεθα* became *-μεσθε* after the analogy of the second plural *-εσθε*; or rather, since *σθ*, though commonly retained in the spelling, was pronounced *στ*, became *-μεστε* after *-εστε*. This happened in present and imperfect alike, and at an early period. The form *-μαστε* which now prevails, though *-μεστε* is also heard, must have arisen first in the imperfect where it owes its *α* to the influence of the third plural in *-αν* or better to the collateral forms in *-αν* or *-ασι*, e.g., *ἐγραφοῦμαστε* after *ἐγραφοῦνταν* or *ἐγραφοῦντασιν*, *ἤμαστε* after *ἤταν* or *ἤσασιν*. That is, such vowel leveling is most likely to occur where there is parallelism in the number of syllables of the ending. Note, for example, that in the chronicle of Morea we have *-μαν* for *-μεν* in *ἐδιάβημαν* beside third plural *ἐδιάβησαν*, similarly *ἐτράπημαν*, *ἐστράφημαν*, etc., whenever the correspondence was *-ημεν*, *-ησαν*, but on the other hand *ἐποιήσαμεν* beside *ἐποίησαν*, etc.

For the second plural the grammarians of the seventeenth century still give *ἦσθε*, *ἐγράφεσθε*, or *ἐγραφοῦσθε*. Since then *-σαστε* has come in beside *-μαστε*, after the analogy of the relation between *-μουν* and *-σουν* in singular, i.e., *-μουν* : *-σουν* = *-μαστε* : *-σαστε*. Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Simon Portius*, p. 199.

"to be" (and even here no active  $\mu$ - form is preserved), have passed over into one of the thematic types or been replaced by unrelated words. Thus we have  $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  for  $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\mu\iota$ ,  $\delta\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$  or  $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega$  for  $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\iota$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\omicron\rho\acute{\omega}$  for  $\delta\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$ , etc.

Presents in  $-\nu\omega$  have spread very extensively at the expense of various others. Thus  $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega$  "bring" ( $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega$ ),  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$  "bind" ( $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ ),  $\chi\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$  "pour" ( $\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ ),  $\acute{\alpha}\phi\acute{\eta}\nu\omega$  "leave" ( $\acute{\alpha}\phi\acute{\eta}\mu\iota$ ), etc.; so regularly  $-\acute{\omega}\nu\omega$  for  $-\acute{\omicron}\omega$  or  $-\acute{\omega}\nu\eta\mu\iota$ , as  $\sigma\kappa\omicron\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\omega$  "slay" ( $\sigma\kappa\omicron\tau\acute{\omicron}\omega$  "darken"),  $\delta\iota\omicron\rho\theta\acute{\omega}\nu\omega$  "mend,"  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\acute{\omega}\nu\omega$  "pay" ( $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\acute{\omicron}\omega$  "fill"),  $\sigma\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\nu\omega$  "spread" ( $\sigma\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\nu\eta\mu\iota$ ),  $\zeta\acute{\omega}\nu\omega$  "gird" ( $\zeta\acute{\omega}\nu\eta\mu\iota$ ), etc. In all these last and many of the others  $-\nu\omega$  is added to the form of the verb-stem which appears in the aorist; that is, they are formed anew from the aorist, e.g.,  $\sigma\kappa\omicron\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\omega$  from  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\kappa\acute{\omicron}\tau\omicron\omega\sigma\alpha$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\phi\acute{\eta}\nu\omega$  from  $\acute{\alpha}\phi\eta\sigma\alpha$ . Presents in  $-\acute{\alpha}\iota\omega$  have been augmented by numerous new formations, many of these also based upon the aorist stem. Thus  $\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$  is replaced by  $\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\alpha}\iota\omega$  ( $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\alpha}\iota\omega$  "understand"), formed from the aorist  $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\beta\alpha$  ( $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\beta\omicron\nu$ ), and similarly  $\lambda\alpha\nu\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ ,  $\mu\alpha\nu\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ ,  $\tau\upsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$  by  $\lambda\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha}\iota\omega$ ,  $\mu\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha}\iota\omega$ ,  $\tau\upsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\iota\omega$ , and  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\omega$  (aor.  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\theta\omicron\nu$ ) by  $\pi\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha}\iota\omega$ . Cf.  $\pi\eta\gamma\acute{\alpha}\iota\omega$  "go" formed to  $\acute{\iota}\pi\eta\gamma\alpha$ , which is in origin the imperfect of  $\acute{\iota}\pi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega$  but had come to be used as an aorist.

CARL D. BUCK

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*Arte e Artificio nel Dramma Greco.* A FRANCESCO GUGLIELMINO.

Catania: Francesco Battiato, 1912. Pp. xii+301. L. 4.

The title indicates the author's point of view and the chief defect of a well-written book, intended for the general reader rather than for the professional scholar. It is a study, from that point of view, of the technique of Greek tragedy. It is in two parts, the first on the conventions of Greek dramatic art and the devices for preserving verisimilitude under those requirements, the second on the ways in which plays are shaped by the desire for immediate effect. Another volume is promised, which is to follow the subject of the second part farther, and thence proceed to consider other aspects of the drama more or less related.

The point of view seems natural, perhaps; the defect of it may not appear at first. Yet the result is unfortunate precisely for the reader who is not technically a scholar. Unless he can make the needed corrections, he may carry away, instead of a true picture of a great art that differs from ours, a picture subtly distorted, and this will tend to confirm some popular prejudices that are due simply to lack of knowledge. The author of course intended no such result; it is merely inseparable from the method of distinguishing an art-form from the details that make up that form, and calling the whole form art and essential components artifices.

Take what is said of the convention that the chorus almost always remains on the scene. We see it from a wrong side unless we take the point